The Mysore Appropriation No. 4 Bill, 1951.

Introduction.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA (Minister for Finance and Industries).—Sir, I introduce the Mysore Appropriation No. 4 Bill, 1951, the same having been published in the Gazette Extraordinary dated the 6th November 1951 under Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly. Copies of the Bills have already been distributed to Hon'ble Members.

Motion to consider.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—I move:

"That the Mysore Appropriation No. 4 Bill, 1951, be taken into consideration."

Sir, in placing this motion for consideration before the House, I do not think I should take very much more time because the circumstances under which the various voted demands were included in the Appropriation Bill have already been explained in the various notes placed before the House. It is also explained that most of these demands are made with a view to utilise the Government of India grants and also the various balances of funds that we have got. I would like to refer to just a few of them.

On page 3 of the Supplementary Estimates, you will find that 50 per cent is covered by the Central grant; so also on page 9 you will find 50 per cent is covered by the Central grant; on page 11 you will find that 13·51 lakhs are met from Sugarcane Cess Fund; on page 12 you will find that the amount is proposed to be met from the Famine Insurance Fund Reserve. You will see how all this is not met so much from taxation and general revenues but met either from the Government of India grants or from the funds that we have got at our disposal. On page 16 you will find that the amount of working expenses is covered by increased sales; on page 17 you will find that the amount of working expenses is covered by increased revenue; on page 19 you will find that the major portion of irrigation expenditure is covered by the Central grant; on page 21 you will find that the advance that we are giving is covered by the stock of foodgrains; and what additional grant is demanded on page 22 does not affect the revenue position at all. As regards the supplementary demand the State's portion will be met either from the cash balance or from the Sinking Fund.

Sri W. H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Bangalore District—General).—The Hon'ble Minister will do well to give it as an abstract as it seems that no member has brought a copy of the Supplementary Estimates.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Each one of the demands was gone through and we are only referring to what is printed in the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Appropriation No. 4 Bill, 1951, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses 2 and 3. The question is:

"That Clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Schedule. The question is:

"That the Schedule stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is:

"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble. The question is:

"That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—I move :

"That the Mysore Appropriation No. 4 Bill, 1951, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Appropriation No. 4 Bill, 1951, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

The Mysore Inam Villages (Abolition of Inam Tenure) Bill, 1951.

Motion to consider—(contd).

Mr. SPEAKER.—Discussion on the motion to consider the Mysore Inam Villages (Abolition of Inam Tenure) Bill, 1951, which had not concluded, will be resumed. Sri H. M. Channabasappa will continue his speech.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Is he continuing his speech, Sir ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Mysore District—General).—Yes, for a short time. I will not take much time.

ಶೃಂಗೇರಿ ಜಹಗೀರಿಗೆ ವಿಶೇಷ ರೀತಿಯ ಏನಾಯಿತಿ ಕೊಡುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ. ಅವರೇನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ,

" We have considered the case of the Sringeri Jahagir in great detail As observed earlier in this report, we have also heard the learned representatives who appeared before us on behalf of the Sringeri Mutt. We have come to the conclusion that in view of the long unbroken tradition of this Mutt we should effect minimum changes in the administration of the Jahagir of this Mutt without at the same time departing from the principles underlying this Bill in regard to inferior holders."

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 'without at the same time departing from the principles underlying this Bill" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಗಮನಾರ್ಹವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಇವರು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಮೂಲ ತತ್ವದಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ 'depart' ಆಗತ್ತದೆ, ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ನೂಡೆ ಮೂಲೋದ್ದೇಶವಲ್ಲಿ ಇನಾಂತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಜಹಗೀರಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದೆಯೆಂದರೆ,

" Abolition of Inams and Jahagirs in the State is being urged in the legislature from a long time....."ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

"the recommendations contained in the report of the Land Reform Committee on this question has been considered and it is found desirable to abolish the tenure of Inam Villages." ಎಂದು. ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ: ಅಂದರೆ ಇನಾಂ tenure ಎಂಬ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯೇ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ರಬಾರದು ಎಂಬುದು ಮೂಲೋದ್ದೇಶ. ಈ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ನಾವು ಇಂದು ಶಾಸನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ,—

" .....effecting minimum changes in the administration of the Jahagir of this Mutt without at the same time departing from the principles....."

ಇದು ಹೇಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ ? Inam tenure ಎಂಬುದೇ ಇರಬಾರದೆಂದು ಮೂಲೋದ್ದೇಶವಿರುವಾಗ, ಆ ಮೂಲೋದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನೇ ಸಾಧನೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ಜಹಗೀರಿ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಆದಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ; ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ legal support ಇದೆ ? ನ್ಯಾಯಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ? ಮೂಲೋದ್ದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ತತ್ವಗಳಿಗೇ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದೆ !!

ಎರಡನೆಯದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

" We also feel that the tenants of Sringeri Mutt as in the case of tenants of other inamdars holding inam villages should be registered as occupants of lands held by them... In regard however to other rights and privileges enjoyed by the Sringeri Mutt for over a number of centuries we feel that an exception is called for and that all these rights and privileges should be continued to the Mutt"

ಎಂದು. " An exception is called for " ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಕಾರಣಗಳಾದರೂ ಏನು ? " Long continued tradition of the mutt" ಎಂದರೆ ಬಹು ಕಾಲದಿಂದ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವೇನಿದೆ, ಆ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ, ಎಂಬುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮೂಲತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಪ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಮಠಕ್ಕಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಅವರ ವಾದ. ನನಗೆ ತೋರುವಂತೆ ಇವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವೇ ಸರಿ. ನಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಇನಾಂ ಟೆನ್ಯೂರನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡುವುದಲ್ಲ, ರೈತರಿಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕು ಎಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ನಮ್ಮ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕನುಗುಣವಾಗಿರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಅವಲ್ಲ. ಜಹಗೀರಿಯನ್ನು ವಜಾ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ನಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕೂ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಶಾಸನ ಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆ, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ propriety ಇದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಅನೇಕ ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ ಬಂದಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಗಳೆಯಕೂಡದು ಎಂಬುದೊಂದೇ ಅವರ ವಾದ.

ಅಮೇಲೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ಎಚ್. ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರಯ್ಯನವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ dissenting note ವಿಷಯ. ಅದನ್ನು